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What is it?

Definition (Evaluation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD - DAC</td>
<td>An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of an ongoing or completed project, program or policy, its design, implementation and results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Evaluation Group (UNEG)</td>
<td>An assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, institutional performance, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uses (Evaluation)

- **For Learning** - improving future projects and programs through the feedback of lessons learned; for knowledge generation
- **For Accountability** - disclosing information to stakeholders; informing resource allocation

NATIONAL EVALUATION POLICY (NEP) Framework (Joint NEDA-DBM Memorandum Circular No. 2015-01)

A policy framework to guide the purposive conduct of evaluations in the public sector in support of good governance, transparency, accountability, and evidence-based decision-making.
Contents of the NEP Framework

Key Elements

Scope/Coverage

Creation of an Inter-Agency Evaluation Task Force and its Secretariat

Guiding Principles/Evaluation Standards

- evaluation criteria
- evaluation competencies
- standards of ethics
- evaluation plans in accordance with best practices
- undertaking evaluations with due regard to impartiality
- reporting, dissemination, and use of evaluations

All programs and projects implemented by the government, regardless of funding source.
**Context: The GPH M&E Timeline**

- **1987**: EO 230
  - Reorganizing NEDA mandates the agency to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the PDP.

- **1989**: NB Resolution No. 30
  - Established the Regional Project Monitoring and Evaluation System (RPMES) for M&E at the sub-national level.

- **1992**: EO 376
  - Further refined and streamlined the roles and responsibilities and operating procedures under the RPMES.

- **1993**: EO 93
  - Further refined and streamlined the roles and responsibilities and operating procedures under the RPMES.

- **1996**: RA 8182 (as amended by RA 8555)
  - Mandated NEDA to conduct an annual review of status of all ODA projects.

- **1999**: NB Resolution No. 3
  - Provides for reporting of project outcomes and impacts by ICC and Implementing Agencies.

- **2001**: Sector Effectiveness and Efficiency Review
  - (Joint exercise by DBM and NEDA, through the 2001 National Budget Call) assessed the responsiveness of programs and projects to sector outcome objectives.

- **2007**: AO 25
  - Provided the mechanism for the establishment of a unified and integrated Results-Based Performance Management System within the Executive Branch of the government.

- **2011**: DBM adopted the Organizational Performance Indicator Framework (OPIF)
  - Which seeks to align good and services supported by the budget with the government’s desired outcome objectives.
The Public Sector Management (PSM)

Features of Results-oriented PSM:
- Presence of core result attributes;
- Focus on common results;
- Interdependency among the components;
- Effective vertical and horizontal linkages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSM Process</th>
<th>Related GPH Process/ Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>President’s guidepost (16 areas for transformational leadership); Philippine Development Plan (PDP); Results Matrix (RM); Public Investment Plan (PIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting (and Programming)</td>
<td>Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF); Organizational Performance Indicator Framework (OPIF); Investment Coordination Committee Programming; General Appropriations Act – National Expenditure Program (GAA – NEP), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Procurement, Contracting, Disbursement, ICC Reevaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance (ODA) Review; Budget Performance Assessment Review (BPAR); Commission on Audit Reports, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Socio – Economic Reports; MDG Reports; Sector, Program, Project Evaluation Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on the results-based Public Sector Management (PSM) framework developed by the Asia-Pacific Community of Practice on Managing for Development Results (APCoP-MfDR), as cited in Tungpalan (2012).
Institutional Framework

Key Oversight Agencies

- National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)
- Department of Budget and Management (DBM)
- Commission on Audit (Constitutional Body)
- Results-based Planning
- Performance-based Budgeting
- Value for money performance-based audits

Existing Mechanisms for the Results-based M&E
(at the national, regional, and local government levels)

- Project Implementation Officers (PIO System)
Evolving Framework for the Harmonized Results-based Performance Management System (AO 25)

Societal Goals/Outcomes

Sectoral Goals/Outcomes
- Good Governance and Anti-Corruption
- Human Development & Poverty Reduction
- Economic Development
- Security, Justice, and Peace
- Climate change

Organizational Outcomes

Major Final Outputs (Product and Service Result Indicators)
- Citizen Focus
- Internal Process and Financial Stewardship
- Learning, Growth and Leadership Results

Enablers/Drivers
- All government agencies

Results/Outcomes

Comprehensive Performance Indicators

EO 43/PDP (RM & OPIF)

PDP

OPIF

Citizen Focus

Internal Process and Financial Stewardship

Learning, Growth and Leadership Results

All government agencies
Why do we need it?

Operating rules & regulations are **lacking** and must be further improved.

Hence, the need to **improve and implement capacity-building initiatives**, and to **develop policies** that would support **results-based management**.

Among these policies include the **NEP Framework**.

Why do we need it?

For the promotion and strengthening of the practice and use of evaluations.

- **Support for Evidence-based Decisions**
  - provide knowledge on project/program results enabling evidence-based decision-making related to current and future programming
    - outcomes/impacts attributable to the project/program;
    - efficiency with which outcomes/impacts are achieved;
    - extent to which outcomes/impacts align with national priorities.

- **Ensuring Program Improvement**
  - provide feedback and learning that can help improve current and future programming

- **Ensuring Accountability**
  - provide to the people of the Philippines, donors and other interested parties of evidence-based findings, both positive and negative on the status and accomplishments of GPH projects/programs.
Why do we need it?

Status Before the NEP Framework

Evaluation Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation takes place in many domains.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of domestic evaluators in different fields.</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National discourse concerning evaluation.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a profession with own societies.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements in the government.</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements in legislative bodies.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralism exists (institutions, evaluators)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation takes place within the audit institution.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome evaluations (not output and process)</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Criteria adapted from Furubu, Rist, Sandahl, 2002, International Atlas of Evaluation. Assessment of country context done by NEDA Deputy Director General Rolando G. Tungpalan, as presented in the 3rd M&E Network Forum, 6 – 8 November 2013*
Evaluation Status Quo

Evaluation Activities

- Evaluations more pronounced at the projects and program levels and are usually conducted by development partners through external evaluators;
- Policy evaluations;
- Sectoral evaluations;
- Evaluation of country assistance strategy;
- Country – level evaluation (e.g., Paris Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals);
- Development Plans (national and regional levels)
## Evaluation Status Quo

### Institutional Mandates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing Agencies</th>
<th>Oversight Agencies</th>
<th>Inter – Agency Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Internal M&amp;E system;</td>
<td>▪ NEDA (planning)</td>
<td>▪ Investment Coordination Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Project Implementation Officers (PIO) System</td>
<td>▪ DBM (budgeting)</td>
<td>▪ Project Monitoring Committees under the Regional Project Monitoring and Evaluation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ COA (auditing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Office of the President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Office of the Cabinet Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PSM, Evaluation Status Quo, & NEP Framework

NEP Framework (alongside other GPH M&E policies)

1. Supports and strengthens systematic, rigorous and impartial evaluation activities in the GPH;
2. Guides evaluation activities of Government agencies.

Evidence-based decisions, accountability, and learning

1. Evidence whether GPH policies, projects and program achieve their intended development results (outputs, outcomes and impacts);
2. Provide/ adopt alternative strategies when evidence suggests that results are not being achieved.

SHARPEN RESULTS FOCUS OF THE GOVERNMENT (within the context of the PSM)

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
- Ensure appropriate management response (follow-through actions) by concerned units to evaluation findings and recommendations.

LINK TO PLANNING
- Ensure that results of evaluations are used as inputs to planning and budgeting processes and subsequent design of similar projects.
How did we formulate it?

- **Lead GPH Agencies**: National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and Department of Budget and Management (DBM)
- **Other Stakeholders**: GPH agencies, Civil Society Organizations, Academe
- **Consultants**: Donald Hall and Ruperto Alonzo (with Technical Assistance from UNICEF, expected date of completion on 30 June 2013)

**Actors:**

**Methodology:**

- Review of other country experiences
  - Literature review
  - Interviews
- Interview of stakeholders
  - Oversight agencies – NEDA, DBM, Dep’t. of Finance, Office of the President – Presidential Management Staff, Commission on Audit
  - Implementing agencies – Dep’t. of Public Works and Highways, Dep’t. of Interior and Local Government, Dep’t. of Agrarian Reform, Dep’t. of Agriculture, Dep’t. of Health
  - Other institutions – House of Representatives, Senate, Academe
Formulation of NEP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants/Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09 Sep 2013</td>
<td>Project Implementation Officers Meeting</td>
<td>Implementing and Oversight Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Sep 2013</td>
<td>National Project Monitoring Committee/RPMES* Forum</td>
<td>NEDA Regional Directors and/or representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Oct 2013</td>
<td>Investment Coordinating Committee of the NEDA Board</td>
<td>Members of the Investment Coordination Committee (ICC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Oct 2013</td>
<td>Public Consultation Forum</td>
<td>CSOs, Academe, Development Partners, M&amp;E Consultants/Practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Nov 2013</td>
<td>3rd M&amp;E Network Forum</td>
<td>Senior officials/practitioners of M&amp;E from South and Southeast Asia (i.e., Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam, and Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Mar 2014</td>
<td>NEDA Management Committee Meeting</td>
<td>NEDA Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 June 2014</td>
<td>Joint Analytic Work (JAW) Meeting</td>
<td>Representatives from ADB, WB, JICA, DFAT (Australia) and USAID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regional Project Monitoring & Evaluation System*
Formulation of NEP:

Timeline (Highlights):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants/Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 June 2014</td>
<td>Consultation Meeting with UNICEF</td>
<td>UNICEF Regional Adviser on Evaluation Ada Ocampo, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist Hammad Masood, NEDA Director Roderick Planta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Aug 2014</td>
<td>NEDA Management Committee Meeting</td>
<td>NEDA Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Sept 2014</td>
<td>Meeting with selected DBM Senior Officials</td>
<td>Usec. Laura Pascua, Usec. Mario Relampagos, Asec. Maxine Tanya Hamada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10 Oct 2014</td>
<td>NEDA-DBM Workshop</td>
<td>Selected NEDA officials and MES Team; selected DBM officials and BPME Team; UNICEF Resource speakers and facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Nov 2014</td>
<td>Public Consultation Forum</td>
<td>Implementing Agencies, Oversight Agencies, CSOs, Academe, Development Partners, M&amp;E Consultants/ Practioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July 2015</td>
<td>Signing of the NEDA – DBM Joint MC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Memorandum Circular (MC)

- Deemed to be the fastest route to effectuate the said framework as the current administration is coming to a close;
- Signatories are the heads of NEDA and DBM
Where are we now?

Continuing Evaluation Strategy

**Short – Term**
- Issuance of the **Joint NEDA-DBM Memorandum Circular (MC)** with the creation of main governing bodies, i.e., Evaluation Task Force, an Evaluation Secretariat, and an interim Technical Working Group (TWG)

**Medium-term**
- The Evaluation Task Force may initiate and lobby the creation of an ad hoc Evaluation Department through an **Executive Order (EO)** which shall directly report to the Office of the President.

**Long-term**
- A **legislation** on the **Philippine National Evaluation Policy** may be enacted. Said policy will formalize the creation of an Evaluation Department that is independent of the executive and legislative branch of the Government.
Where are we now?

Short – Term Strategy

- Creation and establishment of the Evaluation Task Force, which may authorize the creation of a sub-cabinet level Technical Committee.

- Establishment of an Interim Technical Working Group (TWG) to ensure a smooth functional and organizational transition.

- Issuance of separate circular providing details of institutional responsibilities.
Summary & Conclusion

- The NEP is a product of the shift of results-based public sector management, one that is heavily influenced by the international development community;

- Status-quo necessitates for strengthening and supporting of evaluation activities in the GPH;

- Wide-range consultations across various stakeholders were conducted in the policy-making stage;

- A Joint Memorandum Circular was adopted because it was fastest to approve;

- The NEP is necessary to engender an evaluation culture in the GPH, but challenges (i.e., capacity, financial resources, and institutions) in operationalization remain;

- The medium and long-terms evaluation strategy would ensure that the policy would have stronger effect on government processes in the long-run.
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# Contents of the NEP Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Background and Rationale</td>
<td>Highlights results-based initiatives undertaken by NEDA and DBM. Rationale for the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Policy Framework Statement</td>
<td>Conduct of evaluations in the public sector in support of good governance, transparency, accountability and evidence-based decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Purpose</td>
<td>Objectives: (i) support for evidence-based decisions; (ii) promotion of program improvement; and promotion of accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Coverage</td>
<td>All government agencies/offices/institutions are covered by the Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Key Elements of the Evaluation Policy Framework</td>
<td>Scope/ Inter-agency Evaluation Task Force and its Secretariat/ Guiding Principles and Evaluation Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.0 Responsibilities                         | **Implementing Agencies:**  
  ▪ formulate and maintain a rolling 6-year agenda  
  ▪ create neutral evaluation units initially at the central level  
  ▪ evaluation plans during budget submission in accordance with best practices  
  ▪ ensure management response to evaluations and the use of evaluations  
  **Evaluation Task Force:**  
  ▪ provide overall policy directions and coordination on the evaluation agenda/ issue evaluation guidelines  
  **Evaluation Secretariat:**  
  ▪ provide technical and administrative support to the Evaluation Task Force  
  **Interim Technical Working Group:**  
  ▪ ensure smooth functional and organizational transition |
## Contents of the NEP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Adoption/Implementation of the Policy Framework</td>
<td>Adequate resources for IAs and Evaluation Secretariat Orientation and training program for relevant personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Policy Framework Amendment</td>
<td>Revision policy based on formative and summative evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex A: Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Specifies questions that evaluations need to address: (a) Relevance; (b) Effectiveness; (c) Efficiency; (d) Sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex B: Evaluation Competencies</td>
<td>Those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation should demonstrate competencies on: (a) technical foundations; (b) leading, managing and delivering evaluations; (c) communicating and sharing evaluation findings; and (d) integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex C: Ethics</td>
<td>Prescribing standards of ethics in undertaking evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex D: Best Practices in Evaluation</td>
<td>Lays down best practices in evaluation in terms of (a) evaluation scale, and (b) evaluation design and execution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex E: Impartiality</td>
<td>Ensuring impartiality in order to maximize objectivity and minimize potential for bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex F: Reporting, Dissemination, and Use of Evaluations</td>
<td>Prescribing guidelines on reporting, dissemination and use of evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>